REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Communications the Examiner

     On receipt of the final office action dated 5/5/2006 the representative of the Applicants,
Rabindranath Dutta, Registration Number 51,010, had discussed the Examiner's rejections over
the telephone and had submitted via email informally proposed amendments that were likely to
overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph. Applicants received
an email dated 6/30/2006 from the Examiner, and the contents of the emailed included the
following sentences: "I looked over the changes you proposed with a primary examiner. The
changes seem to clarify the issues I raised in the 112 second paragraph rejection. If you submit
this amendment as an after final, I will take a final look at it." Based on the indications provided
in the email dated 6/30/2006 from the Examiner, Applicants are submitting the current
amendment. Applicants believe that the amendments would place the claims in a condition for
allowance.

Correction of typographical errors and antecedent basis errors

     Typographical and/or antecedent basis errors found by the Applicants have been
corrected in claims 18, 41, 43, 45. No new matter has been added.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

     The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, and 35 under 35 U.S.C.
112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim
the subject matter by mentioning that independent claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, and 35 recite
"mappings that indicate remote storage location address" and according to the Examiner it is not
clear from the claims what "mappings" are and how they are used to "indicate remote storage
location addresses". Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, and 35 as

indicated below and submit that the amended independent claims overcome the Examiner's 25 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph based rejections.

Amended Independent claims 1, 14, and 27

Independent claims 1, 14, 27 are for controlling and providing access to files maintained at remote storage locations to a source code management system client over a network, and require:

receiving a request, at a server, for checking-out a file corresponding to a filename, from the source code management system client over the network;

determining from metadata, by the server, a remote storage location address associated with the filename where the requested file is located, wherein the metadata indicates remote storage location addresses corresponding to the files, wherein the metadata includes indications of the number of accesses of the files by a plurality of source code management system clients, wherein the metadata is stored more proximate to the server than to the source code management system client, wherein the remote storage location address is based on a history of request patterns from the plurality of source code management system clients, and wherein the history of request patterns includes the indications of the number of accesses of the files by the plurality of source code management system clients;

sending, by the server, the remote storage location address to the source code management system client, wherein the remote storage location address where the requested file is located is more proximate to the source code management system client than to the server; and

updating, by the server, the metadata to indicate that the requested file is checked-out and locked.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 14, 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraphs and mentioned that it is unclear from the claims what "mappings" are and how they are used to indicate remote storage location addresses".

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 27 to delete the term "mappings" and have rewritten the claims such that the amended claims include the requirements that the metadata indicates remote storage location addresses corresponding to the files and the metadata includes indications of the number of accesses of the files by a plurality of source code management system clients.

The amended claims do not add any new matter. Antecedent basis errors have been corrected.

Applicants do not necessarily agree with the reasons provided by the Examiner for rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, but have amended claims 1, 14, 27 to expedite the prosecution and secure the allowance of the claims.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 14, and 27 are patentable over the cited art.

Amended Independent Claims 10, 23, 36

Independent claims 10, 23, 36 are for accessing a file in a source code management system, comprising:

sending, from a source code management system client, a first request for checking-out the file to a server;

receiving, at the source code management system client, a storage location address containing the file in response to the first request, wherein the storage location address containing the file is located more proximate to the source code management system client than to the server, wherein metadata corresponding to the file is kept more proximate to the server than to the source code management system client, wherein the storage location has been determined from the metadata by the server based on a history of request patterns from a

plurality of source code management system clients, wherein the metadata indicates storage location addresses corresponding to files, wherein the metadata includes indications of the number of accesses of the files by the plurality of source code management system clients, and wherein the history of request patterns includes the indications of the number of accesses of the files by the plurality of source code management system clients;

sending, from the source code management system client, a second request to the storage location address; and

receiving, at the source code management system client, an access to the file from the storage location address, wherein the server updates the metadata to indicate that the file is checked-out and locked after providing the access.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 23, 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraphs and mentioned that it is unclear from the claims what "mappings" are and how they are used to indicate remote storage location addresses".

In response, Applicants have amended claims 10, 23, 36 to delete the term "mappings" and have rewritten the claims such that the amended claims include the requirements that the metadata indicates the storage location addresses corresponding to files and the metadata includes indications of the number of accesses of the files by a plurality of source code management system clients. Applicants request the Examiner to note that while the Examiner has indicated "remote storage location addresses" in his claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, the term used in claims 10, 23, 36 was "storage location addresses" (The term remote storage location addresses was used in independent claims 1, 14, 27).

The amended claims do not add any new matter. Antecedent basis errors have been corrected.

Applicants do not necessarily agree with the reasons provided by the Examiner for rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph. However, Applicants have amended claims 10, 23, 27 to expedite the prosecution and secure the allowance of the claims.

For the above reasons, claims 10, 23, and 27 are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-45

The Examiner has also rejected pending claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-45 that depend on the pending independent claims 1, 14, 27, 10, 23, or 36. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 14, 27, 10, 23, or 36 which are patentable over the cited art for the reason discussed above, and because the combination of the limitations in the dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-45 and the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have indicated appropriate fees. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

The attorney/agent invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 557-2292 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 5, 2006   By: /RabindranathDutta/

                                                  Rabindranath Dutta
                                                  Registration No. 51,010

<u>Please direct all correspondences to</u>:

Rabindranath Dutta
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-557-2292
Fax: 310-556-7984